UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/835,086	04/13/2001	Songxiang Wei	16440.4013	2983

34313	7590	03/28/2006

ORRICK, HERRINGTON & SUTCLIFFE, LLP
IP PROSECUTION DEPARTMENT
4 PARK PLAZA
SUITE 1600
IRVINE, CA 92614-2558

EXAMINER
ISMAIL, SHAWKI SAIF

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2155	

DATE MAILED: 03/28/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/835,086	WEI, SONGXIANG
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Shawki S. Ismail	2155	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>20 January 2006</u>.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) <u>25-37</u> is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) <u>25-37</u> is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6)☐ Other: _____.

RESPONSE TO AMENDMENT

1. This action is responsive to the amendment received on January 20, 2006.

No amendment to the claims have been made.

Claims 1-24 were cancelled and are withdrawn from prosecutions.

Claims 25-37 are pending.

The Old rejection maintained

2. The rejection is respectfully maintained as set forth in the last Office Action mailed on October 20, 2005. Applicants' arguments with respect to claims 25-37 have been fully considered but they are not deemed persuasive and the old rejection is therefore maintained.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 25-37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Boss et al.**, U.S. Patent No. **5,758,110** and in view of **Applicant Admitted Prior Art (AAPA)**.

5.   As to claim 25, Boss teaches a method performed on a computer for sharing

application using screen sampling, the method comprising:

receiving from a presenter a selection of a shared application (col. 2, lines 31-38,

presenter designates an application to be shared with a viewer);

monitoring function calls made by the shared application to dynamically

determine a position and a size of a window displayed in a presenter screen for the

shared application (col. 5, lines 24-39, monitoring function calls to determine position

and size of shared application window);

monitoring an application interface to dynamically determine a position and a size

of an application region of the window displayed in the presenter screen for the shared

application (col. 5, lines 24-39, monitoring function calls to determine position and size

of shared application window);

monitoring function calls made by a non-shared application to dynamically

determine a position and a size of a window displayed in the presenter screen for the

non-shared application (col. 5, lines 24-39, monitoring function calls to determine

position and size of shared application window);

comparing the position and the size of the window for the shared application

against the position and the size of the window for the non-shared application to

determine any overlapping regions in the presenter screen (see Fig. 8, col. 7, line 54 –

col. 8, line 29);

capturing a screen shot of an image corresponding to the window for the shared

application (see Fig. 8, col. 7, line 54 – col. 8, line 29); and

transmitting the screen shot and information for the position and size of the overlapping regions to generate a viewer screen (see Fig. 8, col. 7, line 54 – col. 8, line 29).

Boss teaches sharing graphic application but does not specifically teach DirectDraw API based application.

AAPA teach DirectDraw API based applications (DirectDraw is a well-known application program interface (API) that is used by applications to draw graphics on a presenter's computer screen, page 22 lines 24 – page 23 line 5).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Boss with the teachings of AAPA in order to facilitate shared applications having the DirectDraw APIs at the presenter's client computer.

As to claim 26, Boss teaches the method of Claim 25 as discussed above. Boss further wherein teaches wherein the overlapping region is hatched over so that the viewer is restricted from seeing it's contents.

Boss does not explicitly indicated wherein the transmitted overlapping region is filled with an arbitrary color

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to fill the overlapping region with an arbitrary color in order to make it pleasant to look at or to be able to quickly and easily distinguish it from the shared region.

6.   As to claim 27, Boss teaches the method of Claim 25 further comprising:

compressing the screen shot of the image corresponding to the window for the shared application (see Fig. 12, col. 9, lines 34-59).

7.   As to claim 28, Boss teaches the method of Claim 25 further comprising:

capturing a screen shot of an updated image corresponding to the window for the shared application (col. 6, lines 23-34, col. 6, lines 42-56);

transmitting the screen shot of the updated image corresponding to the window for the shared application to update the viewer screen (col. 6, lines 23-34, col. 6, lines 42-56).

8.   As to claim 29, Boss teaches the method of Claim 25 further comprising:

periodically capturing the image corresponding to the shared application window (col. 2, lines 57-67, col. 5, lines 29-39).

9.   As to claim 30, Boss teaches the method of Claim 25 further comprising:

determining whether the position or the size of either the window for the shared application or the window for the non-shared application has changed (see Fig. 8, 9 col. 7, line 54 – col. 8, line 29); and

transmitting information about the change in the position or the size to update the viewer screen (see Fig. 8, 9 col. 7, line 54 – col. 8, line 29).

10.   Claims 31-37 do not teach or define any new limitations above claims 25-30 and therefore are rejected for similar reasons.

Response to Arguments

11.   Applicant's arguments with respect to clams 25-37 filed on July 29, 2005 have been fully considered but they are not deemed to be persuasive. Applicant argues in substance that:

(A)   Argument: Boss and AAPA do not disclose or teach or suggest "monitoring function calls made by the shared application to dynamically determine a position and a size of a non-DirectDraw region of a window displayed in a presenter screen for a shared application".

Response: The shared application on the host computer is monitored by intercepting tasks (display driver calls) and if the task is part of the shared application it is transmitted and displayed to the client system (col. 2, lines 57-67), therefore, Boss meets the scope of the claimed limitation determining a position and a size of a non-DirectDraw region of a window displayed in a presenter screen by monitoring function calls made by the shared application to a Graphics Device Interface.

(B)   Argument: Boss and AAPA do not disclose or teach determining the size and position of both a non-DirectDraw region and a DirectDraw region of the window for the shared application.

Response: Boss teaches determining a size and position of a graphics application that a host user wants to share with another user at a remote location. Boss teaches determining the size and position of both the graphics application region that the host user wants to share and the non-graphics application region that the host does not want to share (col. 5, lines 24-39). As explained in the previous office action Boss

does not explicitly teach wherein the graphics application is a DirectDraw API based application. However, AAPA teach DirectDraw API based applications (DirectDraw is a well-known application program interface (API) that is used by applications to draw graphics on a presenter's computer screen, page 22 lines 24 – page 23 line 5). Therefore, Boss in view of AAPA meets the scope of the claimed limitation.

(C)   Argument: Boss nor AAPA disclose or teach determining the position and size of the DirectDraw region by monitoring a DirectDraw com interface.

Response: Boss teaches determining a size and position of a graphics application that a host user wants to share with another user at a remote location. Boss teaches monitoring function calls made by the graphical user interface to determine the size and position of the graphics application (col. 5, lines 24-39). As explained in the previous office action Boss does not explicitly teach wherein the graphics application is a DirectDraw API based application. However, AAPA teach DirectDraw API based applications (DirectDraw is a well-known application program interface (API) that is used by applications to draw graphics on a presenter's computer screen, page 22 lines 24 – page 23 line 5). Therefore, Boss in view of AAPA meets the scope of the claimed limitation.

12.   **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not

mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the

shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any

extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later

than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Contact Information

13.   Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Shawki S Ismail whose telephone number is 571-272-

3985. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:30 - 5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Saleh Najjar can be reached on 571-272-4006. The fax phone number for

the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the

Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Shawki Ismail
Patent Examiner
March 23, 2006

SALEH NAJJAR
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER